

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 10, 2004. Claims 1 to 8, 13, 15, and 17 to 24 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 17 and 18 are the independent claims. Claims 19 to 24 have been added and Claims 1 to 8, 13, 15, 17, and 18 have been amended.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 7, 13, 14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 653,598 (Johnson). Claims 8 to 12, 15, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Johnson. Claims 9 to 12, 14, and 16 have been cancelled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns both creation and modification of Web documents, which are stored on a Web document server, according to commands printed on a control sheet and content printed on a content sheet.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended discloses a method for processing Web documents to be stored on a Web document server. The particular type of processing to be performed (creation or modification) is determined based on a control sheet. The processing is performed and the created or modified Web document is stored on the Web document server. Independent Claim 8 as amended discloses a method for processing Web documents as in Claim 1 in a case where the control sheet includes both commands for creating a new Web document and commands for adding a hyperlink at a specific location on a Web document.

Independent Claims 13 and 17 as amended respectively represent system and medium embodiments of independent Claim 1, and independent Claims 15 and 18 as amended respectively represent system and medium embodiments of independent Claim 8.

The cited prior art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, Johnson is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of determining whether to create a new Web document or to modify a preexisting Web document. As a consequence, Johnson could not possibly disclose creating or modifying a Web document in accordance with the commands on a control sheet and content on a content sheet, nor could it disclose storing the created or modified Web document on a Web document server.

Johnson discloses a multi-function printer device capable of being controlled via printed job control sheets. The device is capable of printing a document or transmitting an image of a document to a predetermined address based upon the commands printed on the control sheet. See Johnson, Abstract; col.7, lines 14-27.

The Office Action took the position that Johnson disclosed an apparatus for digital document control capable of generating documents in accordance with a control sheet and a content sheet; and storing the documents to the network, citing the Abstract, Fig. 6, and column 6, line 30 through column 7, line 27 of Johnson. Applicants do not agree that this is a correct assessment of Johnson. Nevertheless, it is respectfully asserted that absolutely nothing in Johnson teaches or suggests processing of a Web document for storage on a Web document server.

The Office Action further took the position that modification of documents would have been obvious because creating and modifying are both data processing

functions. Applicants disagree and respectfully submit that the position of the Office Action is an unwarranted extension of the actual disclosure of Johnson without any citation to prior art. If the Office Action persists in this position it is respectfully requested that it provide a supporting citation to prior art. See MPEP § 2144.03.

Johnson is also not seen to add hyperlinks to a Web document, as claimed in Claim 8. The present application discloses identification of a text Web site address on a content sheet as a hyperlink to be added at a specific location on a Web document. Johnson does not disclose or suggest this capability.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 17, and 18 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied reference.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-22008

CA_MAIN 82058v1